



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,154	09/20/2005	Margaretha Grind	056291-5256	1056
9629 7590 05/14/2009 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004				
EXAMINER AUDET, MAURY A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1654				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/550,154

Applicant(s)

GRIND, MARGARETHA

Examiner

MAURY AUDET

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/22/09.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 16, 18-27, 30-41 and 45-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-27, 30-41 and 45-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 16 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/20/05 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

As indicated previously, the present application has been transferred from former Examiner Khanna to the present Examiner.

Pending a final updated search, were Applicant to cancel the subject matter to the phrase, "solvate or prodrug" (or expressly claim those solvates or prodrugs supported in the description) - still rejected under 35 USC 112 1st Written Description – the application would likely receive favorable consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st Written Description

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The rejection of claims 14, 16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, is maintained for the reasons of record. Applicant's arguments and amendments (latter to delete derivatives but not include solvates in addition to prodrugs, within the metes and bounds of the claimed invention) have been considered but are not found persuasive. The claims remain drawn to any solvate or prodrug of melanogatran, of which a review of the present description and evidence of record (e.g. no affidavits/declaration), of which there is deemed insufficient description of either subgenus, at the time of filing, to substantiate WHICH, if any, solvates or prodrugs, of melagatran, Applicant had "possession" of at the time of the invention - as capable of carrying out this asserted new method of use for melagatran - lowering cholesterol.

The rejection is repeated below for continuity of record. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurka, 19 USPQ2d 1111, states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought; he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, is *whatever is now claimed*" (see page 1117).

A review of the language of the claim indicates that these claims are drawn to a genus, i.e., *any melagatran derivative*.

A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that, while applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of the genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states "An adequate written description of a DNA ... requires a precise definition, such

as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention".

There is no per se "derivatives" species of the claimed genus disclosed that is within the scope of the claimed genus, other than various prodrugs. Thus based on the open interpretation of the term "derivative", which could include e.g. fragments, there is substantial variability among the species which do not permit the mere statement aforementioned as a substitute for the description of said derivatives, e.g. specific fragments, etc.

One of skill in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the genus of which comprises any nasal peptide fragment. The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (see *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 14, 16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. (US 2004/0067995 A1), has been dropped in view of applicant's traversal via argument, deemed persuasive.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MAURY AUDET whose telephone number is (571)272-0960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th. 7AM-5:30PM (10 Hrs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MA, 5/9/09

/Cecilia Tsang/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1654